UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,435	01/10/2001	Brian S. Kim	159569-0004	8491

29000 7590 06/22/2007	EXAMINER
IRELL & MANELLA LLP	LY, ANH
1800 AVENUE OF THE STARS	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

SUITE 900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/757,435	01/10/2001	Brian S. Kim	WISEnut 704	8491

27498   7590   03/26/2007
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER
LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 10/06)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/757,435	KIM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2162	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 February 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-96</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>53-96</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is response t Applicants' AMENDMENT filed on 02/22/2007.

Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

2.   The request filed on 02/22/2007 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/757,435 is acceptable and a

RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

3.   Claims 1-52 have been cancelled.

4.   Claims 53-96 are pending in this Application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6.   Claims 53 and 91are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter

which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed,

had possession of the claimed invention. The limitations "a content analysis of a

selected page based on the number of uses" in claim 53 and "an anchor text content

score" and "a page weighting factor" both in claim 91 do not support in the description of

the applications' specification. Applicant is advised to amend the claim to clarify it and

for their intended use in order to one of ordinary skill in the art to make use the invention

as claimed. Applicant is reminded that no new subject matter should be added.

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claims 53 and 91 are recited the limitation "the relevancy of page", "the relevancy or words" in lines 1 and 4 of claim 53 and "the relevancy of pages" in line 1 and "a collection of pages" and "hypertext linking page" in line 3 of claim 91. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

9.   Claims 53 and 91 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Because "the pages" in line 4 of claim 53 is not clearly meaning. It is for relevancy of pages, collection of pages or linking hypertext pages, as well as the "that pages" and "that linking page" in line 16 of claim 91. Applicant is advised to amend the claim to clarify it and for their intended use in order to one of ordinary skill in the art to make use the invention as claimed. Applicant is reminded that no new subject matter should be added.

Claim Objections

10.   Claims 53 and 91 are objected to because of the following informalities:

The "linking page" in lines 10, 12-13 of claim 53 should replace with "linking hypertext pages" (see preamble).

"the anchor text score in line 15 of claim 91 should replace with "the anchor text content score".

"linking page" in line 15, 16 of claim 91 should replace with "hypertext linking page" (see preamble).

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
> are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
> person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived
> by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13.   Claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub.

No.: US 20040030688 A1 of Aridor et al. (hereinafter Aridor) in view of Patent No.: US

6,871,202 B1 issued to Broder.

With respect to claim 53, Aridor teaches a computer-implemented method of

ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking hypertext pages

(ranking a plurality of web pages in a collection of linked pages: sections 0018-0019 and

0024), comprising:

crawling the World Wide Web to produce a collection of pages (searching a

corpus of document to produce and identify a set of reference documents fig.1 abstract

and sections 0017, 0074 and 0078);

ranking the relevancy of words on the pages to produce a database indexed by

words, the database searchable to produce ranked search results in response to a

search query (applying ranking algorithm on a collection of web pages to produce

ranked result of a set of web pages or documents based on the particular query and to

the domain of interest: section 0024):

the ranking performed by determining an intrinsic ranking factor for a selected

page, by a content analysis of a selected page based on the number of uses of at least

one selected word of text on the selected page (); and

ranking the relevancy of the selected page for the at least one selected word by

combining the intrinisic and extrinsic ranking factors related thereto (ranking the

document from a collection of web pages or document and showing the relevancy and

the relationship of the content of page or documents: sections 0024, 0033 and 0052).

Aridor teaches searching the web pages from a collection or list of web page and

ranking the web pages and producing ranked search results based on the query. Aridor

does not clearly teach determining an intrinsic ranking factor for a selected page by a

content analysis of the selected page based on the number of uses of at least one

selected word on the selected page and determining an extrinsic ranking factor for the

selected page, for each linking page in the collection of pages containing an outbound

link to the selected page, use by a content analysis of each linking page based on the number of uses of the at least one selected word on the linking page.

However, Broder teaches ranking factor and determining the relevance from the content of a document and determining the relationship between the documents (col. 2, lines 52-65, col. 4, lines 36-42, col. 5, lines 12-20 and col. 7, lines 30-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor with the teachings of Broder. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of combining the ranking factors for selected page as determining the relevance the content and the relationship of the document as disclosed (Broder's col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42), into the system of Aridor for the purpose of identifying related pages in a hyperlinked database environment such as the World Wide Web, thereby, enabling the use to retrieve only the most relevant resources to the query (Broder's col. 1, lines 10-45).

14.   Claims 54-59, 74-75, 80-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 20040030688 A1 of Aridor et al. (hereinafter Aridor) in view of Patent No.: US 6,871,202 B1 issued to Broder and further in view of Patent No.: US 6,285,999 B1 issued to Page.

With respect to claims 54-59, Aridor in view of Broder discloses a method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking hypertext pages as discussed in claim 53. Also, Brother teaches relevance of the content as intrinsic

ranking factor and relationship between documents as extrinsic ranking factor (col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42).

Aridor and Broder disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Aridor and Broder do not teach weighting factor related to the linking page.

However, Page teaches weighting factor for linking pages (col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 12-38, col. 7, lines 2-22 and lines 28-36; also see col. 9, lines 2-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder with the teachings of Page by incorporating the use of weighting factor to the linking pages. The motivation being to assign ranks to nodes in a linked database, and being useful for estimating the amount of attention any receives on the web, thereby, being easy for viewing the document based on the link pointing to the document (Page's col. 7, lines 55-64).

With respect to claims 74-75, Aridor teaches a method as discussed in claim 53.

Aridor teaches searching the web pages from a collection or list of web page and ranking the web pages and producing ranked search results based on the query. Aridor does not clearly teach determining an intrinsic ranking factor for a selected page for use of a plurality of selected words on the selected page; and adjust the intrinsic ranking factor for a proximity between at least two of the plurality of selected words on the selected page and adjusting the intrinsic ranking factor for a word order between at least two of the plurality of selected words on the selected page.

However, Broder teaches ranking factor and determining the relevance from the content of a document and determining the relationship between the documents (col. 2, lines 52-65, col. 4, lines 36-42, col. 5, lines 12-20 and col. 7, lines 30-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor with the teachings of Broder. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of combining the ranking factors for selected page as determining the relevance the content and the relationship of the document as disclosed (Broder's col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42), into the system of Aridor for the purpose of identifying related pages in a hyperlinked database environment such as the World Wide Web, thereby, enabling the use to retrieve only the most relevant resources to the query (Broder's col. 1, lines 10-45).

With respect to claims 80-81, Aridor teaches a method as discussed in claim 53.

Aridor teaches searching the web pages from a collection or list of web page and ranking the web pages and producing ranked search results based on the query. Aridor does not clearly teach determining an extrinsic ranking factor for a selected page for use of a plurality of selected words on the linking page and adjusting the extrinsic ranking factor for a word order between at least two of the plurality of selected words on the linking page and determining an extrinsic ranking factor for a selected page for use of a plurality of selected word in the vicinity of the outbound link to the selected page on each linking page.

However, Broder teaches ranking factor and determining the relevance from the

content of a document and determining the relationship between the documents (col. 2,

lines 52-65, col. 4, lines 36-42, col. 5, lines 12-20 and col. 7, lines 30-35).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor with the teachings

of Broder. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the

use of combining the ranking factors for selected page as determining the relevance the

content and the relationship of the document as disclosed (Broder's col. 2, lines 52-65

and col. 4, lines 36-42), into the system of Aridor for the purpose of identifying related

pages in a hyperlinked database environment such as the World Wide Web, thereby,

enabling the use to retrieve only the most relevant resources to the query (Broder's col.

1, lines 10-45).

15.   Claims 60-73, 76-79, 82-90 and 91-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Pub. No.: US 20040030688 A1 of Aridor et al. (hereinafter

Aridor) in view of Patent No.: US 6,871,202 B1 issued to Broder and further in view of

Patent No.: US 6,285,999 B1 issued to Page and Patent No.: US 6,546,388 B1 issued

to Edlund et al. (hereinafter Edlund).

With respect to claims 60-61, Aridor in view of Broder and Page discloses a

method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking

hypertext pages as discussed in claim 53. Also, Brother teaches relevance of the

content as intrinsic ranking factor and relationship between documents as extrinsic

ranking factor (col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42).

Aridor, Broder and Page disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Aridor, Broder and Page do not teach outbound link to the selected page on each

linking page.

However, Edlund teaches range or limit of a word on the page (col. 2, lines 10-

26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder

and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the

page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for

a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher

ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claims 62-65, Aridor in view of Broder and Page discloses a

method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking

hypertext pages as discussed in claim 53. Also, Brother teaches relevance of the

content as intrinsic ranking factor and relationship between documents as extrinsic

ranking factor (col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42).

Aridor, Broder and Page disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Aridor, Broder and Page do not teach wherein the at least one selected word is

related to a query; selected pages for each of a plurality of selected words; forming one

or more databases including data related to the rankings of each of the selected pages

on which each of the selected words is used; and responding to a query with a result set of pages, each page in the result set ranked in accordance with the rankings of that page for one or more of the plurality of selected words related to the query; indexing at least one of said one or more databases in accordance with the plurality of selected words; determining the content of each selected page, extracting outbound link from each selected page and deriving the page weighting factor for each selected page (col. 6, lines 50-67 and col. 7, lines 1-38; also see col. 7, lines 60-67 and col. 8, lines 1-8).

However, Edlund teaches selected word/page related to a query, indexing (col. 3, lines 22-50, col. 3, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-10 col. 19, lines 15-30 and col. 20, lines 5-25.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claim 66, Aridor in view of Broder teaches a computer-implemented method of ranking the relevancy of pages as discussed in claim 53.

Aridor teaches searching the web pages from a collection or list of web page and ranking the web pages and producing ranked search results based on the query. Broder teaches ranking factor and determining the relevance from the content of a document and determining the relationship between the documents. Arider and Broder

do not clearly teaches using a reservoir of bi-directional links to and from each of the selected pages in order to be able to determine the page weighting factor related for each selected page in accordance with a probability of a user viewing that selected page as a result of viewing pages in a random fashion in the collection.

However, Page teaches probability factor and viewing the document (col. 5, lines 8-67 and col. 6, lines 1-60 and col. 3, lines 8-30, col. 7, lines 55-64).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Brother with teaching of Page. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of combining the ranking factors as disclosed (Page's col. 8, lines 42-48), into the system of Aridor and Broder for the purpose of being useful for estimating the amount of attention any receives on the web, thereby, being easy for viewing the document based on the link pointing to the document (Page's col. 7, lines 55-64).

With respect to claims 67-73, Aridor in view of Broder and Page discloses a method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking hypertext pages as discussed in claim 53. Also, Brother teaches relevance of the content as intrinsic ranking factor and relationship between documents as extrinsic ranking factor (col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42).

Aridor, Broder and Page disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Aridor, Broder and Page do not teach determining a frequency of the use of the at least one selected word on the selected page; determining a location of the at least one selected word on the selected page; determining use of the at least one selected

word on the selected page, compared to use of other words on the selected page;

determining location of the at least one selected word on the selected page;

determining a manner of usage of the at least one selected word on the selected page

compared to other words on the selected page; determining a manner of usage the at

least one selected word on the selected page compared to other words on the selected

page and determining a size of a paragraph in which the at least one selected word is

used in the linking page.

However, Edlund teaches selected word/page related to a query, indexing (col. 3,

lines 22-50, col. 3, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-10 col. 19, lines 15-30 and col. 20,

lines 5-25); location of the word (col. 1, lines 62-65 and col. 2, lines 10-26) and

comparing the words (col. 11, lines 42-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder

and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the

page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for

a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher

ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claims 76-79, Aridor in view of Broder and Page discloses a

method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking

hypertext pages as discussed in claim 53. Also, Brother teaches relevance of the

content as intrinsic ranking factor and relationship between documents as extrinsic

ranking factor (col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42).

Aridor, Broder and Page disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Aridor, Broder and Page do not teach determining an extrinsic ranking factor for a selected page for use of a plurality of selected word in the vicinity of the outbound link to the selected page on each linking page; determining an extrinsic ranking factor for a selected page for use of a plurality of selected words on the selected page and adjusting the extrinsic ranking factor for a proximity between at least two of the plurality of selected words on the linking page; and adjusting the extrinsic ranking factor for a word order between at least two of the plurality of selected words on the linking page.

However, Edlund teaches selected word/page related to a query, indexing (col. 3, lines 22-50, col. 3, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-10 col. 19, lines 15-30 and col. 20, lines 5-25); location of the word (col. 1, lines 62-65 and col. 2, lines 10-26) and comparing the words (col. 11, lines 42-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claims 82-90, Aridor in view of Broder and Page discloses a method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including linking hypertext pages as discussed in claim 53. Also, Brother teaches relevance of the

content as intrinsic ranking factor and relationship between documents as extrinsic

ranking factor (col. 2, lines 52-65 and col. 4, lines 36-42).

• Aridor, Broder and Page disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Aridor, Broder and Page do not teach ranking the relevancy of the selected page

for a plurality of selected words and adjusting the ranking in accordance with proximity

between at least two of the plurality of selected words; adjusting the ranking in

accordance with proximity between at least two of the plurality of selected words;

ranking the relevancy of the selected page for a plurality of selected words and

adjusting the ranking in accordance with proximity between at least two of the plurality

of selected words; determining a frequency of the use of a plurality of selected words on

the selected page and adjusting the intrinsic ranking factor in accordance with proximity

between at least two of the plurality of selected words; determining a frequency of the

use of a plurality of selected words on the selected page and adjusting the intrinsic

ranking factor in accordance with proximity between at least two of the plurality of

selected words; determining a frequency of the use of a plurality of selected words on

the selected page and adjusting the intrinsic ranking factor in accordance with proximity

between at least two of the plurality of selected words; determining a location of the use

of a plurality of selected words on the selected page; determining the use of a plurality

of selected words on the selected page, compared to use of other word on the selected

page and adjusting the intrinsic ranking factor in accordance with proximity between at

least two of the plurality of selected words; and determining the use of a plurality of

selected words on the selected page, compared to use of other word on the selected

page and adjusting the intrinsic ranking factor in accordance with proximity between at least two of the plurality of selected words.

However, Edlund teaches selected word/page related to a query, indexing (col. 3, lines 22-50, col. 3, lines 65-67 and col. 14, lines 1-10 col. 19, lines 15-30 and col. 20, lines 5-25); location of the word (col. 1, lines 62-65 and col. 2, lines 10-26) and comparing the words (col. 11, lines 42-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claim 91, Aridor teaches a computer-implemented method of ranking the relevancy of pages in a collection of pages including hypertext-linking pages (ranking a plurality of web pages in a collection of linked pages: sections 0018-0019 and 0024), comprising:

for each page of a collection of pages including hypertext linking pages (collection of linked pages: section 0024);

a content score for the use of each one of a plurality of selected words on said each page (scoring for each document or page: sections 0066 and 0096);

an anchor text content score for each plurality of selected words, related to the use of one or more of the plurality of selected words in associated (anchor text

associated on page with the link to the query term or selected words: sections 0096 and 0110-0112);

for each of the plurality of selected words, ranking a relevancy of each page in accordance with the content score for that page adjusted in accordance (ranking for each page associated on score: sections 0096, 0101 and 0113);

the anchor text score for each linking page (anchor text to the link page: sections 0096 and 0110-0112); and

building a searchable database indexed in accordance with the selected words for producing a ranked search results in response to a search query (building or obtain the search result based on the query: sections 0015 and 0020-0021).

Aridor teaches searching the web pages from a collection or list of web page and ranking the web pages and producing ranked search results based on the query. Aridor does not clearly teach ranking factor for each linking page in the collection of pages.

However, Broder teaches ranking factor and determining the relevance from the content of a document and determining the relationship between the documents (col. 2, lines 52-65, col. 4, lines 36-42, col. 5, lines 12-20 and col. 7, lines 30-35).

Therefore, in the combination of Aridor and Broder do not clearly teach weighting factor related to the linking page.

However, Page teaches weighting factor for linking pages (col. 3, lines 55-67, col. 4, lines 12-38, col. 7, lines 2-22 and lines 28-36; also see col. 9, lines 2-65).

Therefore, the combination of Aridor, Broder and Page do not clearly teach outbound link, selected page/word.

However, Edlund teaches range or limit of a word on the page (col. 2, lines 10-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claim 92, Aridor teaches a method of ranking the relevancy of pages in collections of pages as discussed in claim 91.

Aridor teaches searching the web pages from a collection or list of web page and ranking the web pages and producing ranked search results based on the query. Aridor does not clearly teach ranking factor for each linking page in the collection of pages. Broder teaches ranking factor and determining the relevance from the content of a document and determining the relationship between the documents. Page teaches weighting factor for linking pages. In combination, Aridor, Broder and Page do not clearly teach outbound link, selected page/word.

However, Edlund teaches range or limit of a word on the page (col. 2, lines 10-26).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Aridor in view of Broder and Page with the teachings of Edlund by incorporating the use of outbound link to the

page on each linking page. The motivation being to bring the most popular resources for a particular query to the top of the list of the result page, thereby, bringing a higher ranking (Edlund's col. 2, lines 60-67 and col. 3, lines 10-15).

With respect to claim 93, Aridor teaches forming one or more databases of the relevance rankings for the use of each of the plurality of selected words on each of the pages of the collection and searching the one or more databases to respond to a query with a result set of pages ranked for use of one or more the selected words (collection of web pages and searching the pages: sections 0011-0012, 0035 and 0098).

With respect to claim 94, Aridor teaches forming one or more databases of the relevance rankings for the use of each of the plurality of selected words on each of the pages of the collection and searching the one or more databases to respond to a query with a result set of pages ranked for use of one or more the selected words (collection of web pages and searching the pages: sections 0011-0012, 0035 and 0098).

With respect to claim 95, Aridor teaches adjusting the ranking in accordance with a proximity between the at least two of the plurality of words (ranking in proximity: sections 0033 and 0088).

With respect to claim 96, Aridor teaches adjusting the ranking in accordance with a word order between the at least two of the plurality of words (ranking based on the order of scores of the words: section 0098).

Contact Information

16.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should directed to ANH LY, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via e-mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV **(written authorization being given by Applicant(s) - MPEP 502.03 [R-2])** or fax to (571) 273-4039 (examiner's personal fax number).

The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene,** can be reached on **(571) 272-4107.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

ANH LY
MAR. 10th, 2007